

**No. 9/5/884-6Lab./451.**—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Foma Rubber, Plot No. 84, Sector-24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 32/1984

between

SHRI KEDAR NATH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S FOMA RUBBER, PLOT NO. 84, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workman.

Shri Sudhir Kumar Chopra, for the management.

#### AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Kedar Nath, workman and the management of M/s Foma Rubber, Plot No. 84, Sector-24, Faridabad to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Kedar Nath was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to both the parties. Shri Sudhir Kumar Chopra, Partner of the respondent, stated that the dispute between the workman and the management had already been settled,—vide settlement Ex. M-1 and that the workman had already received Rs. 6,340 in full and final settlement of his claim,—vide voucher Ex. M-2 and the receipt Ex. M-3 out of which Rs. 4,500 had been received by him in cash and the balance amount of Rs. 1,840 had been adjusted towards the advance taken by him and that no dispute was now left between the parties. He further stated that the documents were correct. Shri Darshan Singh, representative of the workman stated that he had heard the above statement made by the representative of the management which was correct and that the dispute had already been settled,—vide documents Ex. M-1 to M-3 mentioned above and that no dispute was left between the parties. In view of the testimony of Shri Sudhir Kumar Chopra, partner of the management and Shri Darshan Singh, representative of the workman and recitals made in the documents Ex. M-1 to M-3, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 15th January, 1985.

R. N. BATRA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 71, dated the 15th January, 1985.

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

**No. 9/5/884-6Lab./462.**—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Tekedar Joginder Singh, son of Shri Phool Singh c/o Thermal Power Project Asaan, Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA AT AMBALA CITY

Reference No. 89 of 1984

between

SHRI RAM MEHAR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS TEKEDAR JOGINDER SINGH, SON OF SHRI PHOOL SINGH, C/O THERMAL POWER PROJECT, ASSAN PANIPAT

Present.—

Shri Karam Singh, for the workman.

None, for the respondent.

**AWARD**

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred,—*vide* clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute between Shri Ram Mehar Singh, workman and the management of Tekedar Joginder Singh, son of Shri Phool Singh c/o Thermal Power Project, Assan, Panipat. The terms of the reference are as under:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Mehar Singh, workman was justified and in order? If to not, to what relief is he entitled to ?

Both the parties were summoned. Applicant appeared. Respondent not served. It reflects that his whereabouts are not known. Workman was asked to furnish fresh address of respondent but he failed to do so. Applicant's representative Shri Karam Singh made a statement that whereabouts of respondent contractor Shri Joginder Singh are not known. He withdrew this reference with permission to file a fresh on the availability of the respondent. His request is allowed. Reference be consigned to record room.

Dated the 4th January, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 92, dated Ambala City, the 16th January, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/884-6Lab/463.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Metal Industries Raja Sahib Street, Jagadhari, Ambala.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
AMBALA AT AMBALA CITY

Reference No. 17 of 1984

between

SHRI MAN PAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS HARYANA METAL  
INDUSTRIES, RAJA SAHIB STREET, JAGADHRI, AMBALA

Present :—

Shri Rajeshwar Nath, for the workman.  
Shri Subhash Bindra, for the respondent-management.

**AWARD**

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred,—*vide* clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute between Shri Man Pal, workman and the management of Messrs Haryana Metal Industries Raja Sahib Street Jagadhri, Ambala. The terms of the reference are as under:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Man Pal, workman was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled to ?

Both the parties were served. Their counsel appeared today, i.e. 8th January, 1985. Counsel for the parties made statements that parties have compromised the dispute completely. No dispute remains for settlement. I passed my award accordingly.

Dated the 8th January, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 93, dated the 16th January, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.